

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings correct typographical errors in FIG. 3.

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet (FIG. 3)
One (1) Annotated Sheet (FIG. 3)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite, inter alia, “embodied in a circuit for performing the LMS algorithm”, “when the error converges within the range of the threshold of visibility”, “when the error does not converge within the range of the threshold of visibility and a control signal is in a first state”, “embodied in a circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm”, “when the error does not converge within the range of the threshold of visibility and the control signal is in a second state”, and “wherein the circuit for performing the LMS algorithm is part of the circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm”; amend claim 8 to recite, inter alia, “a decoder arranged and configured to receive a control signal and an output signal of the CEC unit and to produce a decoder output signal”, “the decoder output signal is in a first state”, and “the decoder output signal is in a second state”; and amend claim 16 to recite, inter alia, “means for receiving the control signal and the comparator output signal and for producing a decoder output signal” and “based on the decoder output signal”; all to better define the claimed invention.

Applicants also make other amendments to claims 1-17 to improve clarity. No new matter is introduced.

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-17 were pending in the application. After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-17 remain pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-7; rejected claims 1, 3-11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-091965 A to Sudo et al. (“Sudo”); and rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,541,956 to Ueda (“Ueda”).

The Examiner also stated that claims 12-15 are allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 12-15 are allowed.

Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings correct typographical errors in FIG. 3.

Objection to the Claims

As discussed above, Applicants amend independent claim 1 to recite, inter alia, "when the error converges within the range of the threshold of visibility", "when the error does not converge within the range of the threshold of visibility and a control signal is in a first state", and "when the error does not converge within the range of the threshold of visibility and the control signal is in a second state".

Applicants submit that these amendments obviate the Examiner's objections to claims 1-7.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

As also discussed above, Applicants amend independent claim 1 to recite, inter alia, "embodied in a circuit for performing the LMS algorithm", "embodied in a circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm", and "wherein the circuit for performing the LMS algorithm is part of the circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm".

Applicants submit that Sudo does not teach, expressly or inherently, at least these claim limitations. As a result, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo. Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-7 also are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo, at least because they depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Additionally, as discussed above, Applicants amend independent claim 8 to recite, inter alia, “a decoder arranged and configured to receive a control signal and an output signal of the CEC unit and to produce a decoder output signal”, “the decoder output signal is in a first state”, and “the decoder output signal is in a second state”.

Applicants submit that Sudo does not teach, expressly or inherently, at least these claim limitations. As a result, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo. Applicants submit that dependent claims 9-11 also are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo, at least because they depend directly from claim 8.

As further discussed above, Applicants amend independent claim 16 to recite, inter alia, “means for receiving the control signal and the comparator output signal and for producing a decoder output signal” and “based on the decoder output signal”.

Applicants submit that Sudo does not teach, expressly or inherently, at least these claim limitations. As a result, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo. Applicants submit that dependent claim 17 also is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sudo, at least because it depends directly from claim 16.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As discussed above, Applicants submit that Sudo does not teach, expressly or inherently, at least “embodied in a circuit for performing the LMS algorithm”, “embodied in a circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm”, and “wherein the circuit for performing the LMS algorithm is part of the circuit for performing the Kalman algorithm”. Applicants further submit that Ueda does not overcome this deficiency of Sudo.

As a result, Applicants submit that Sudo in view of Ueda does not teach or suggest at least these claim limitations. As a result, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sudo in view of Ueda.

Request for Reconsideration and Allowance

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-17 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
703.668.8000

JAC/LFG/cm

FIG. 3

